C) REMARKS

This Response is filed in response to the Office Action dated January 31, 2007.

Entry of this Response and Affidavit supplemented by experimental results is requested. Upon entry of this supplemental Response, claims 1-2 and 6-26 will be pending in this Application.

Applicant teleconferenced with the Examiner on several instances between February 15, 2007 and April 11, 2007 regarding deficiencies in the declaration filed on December 11, 2006. Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicant during these teleconferences. As a result of these teleconferences, Applicant has provided a supplemental Declaration under 37 C.F.R. §1.132 executed by Andrew J. Skoog, the first named inventor of the present invention, including with this Declaration, additional testing (Figures 1-6) conducted in November 2006. The supplemental Declaration has been clarified to address the rejections, such as indicating air-assisted spraying, airless spraying, brushing and decal transfer are applied at ambient temperature and pressure conditions.

In addition, independent claims 1 and 24 are amended to clarify that air-assisted spraying, airless spraying, brushing and decal transfer are applied at ambient temperature and pressure conditions.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected statements made in the declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.132; rejected claims 1-2, 6-10 and 12-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagaraj et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,545,437) hereinafter "Nagaraj" in view of Klabunde (U.S. Patent No. 4,877,647) hereinafter "Klabunde" and further in view of Kirk-Othmer; rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagaraj in view of Klabunde and further in view of Kirk-Othmer and in view of Driver (Great Britain Patent No. GB 2,060,436) hereinafter "Driver"; rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagaraj in view of Klabunde and further in view of Kirk-Othmer and further in view of Vakil (U.S. Patent No. 5,407,705) hereinafter "Vakil"; rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagaraj in view of Eppler; rejected claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagaraj in view of Klabunde and further in view of Kirk-Othmer and further in view of Eppler; rejected claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagaraj in view of Klabunde and further in view of Kirk-Othmer and further in view of Klabunde and further in view of Kirk-Othmer and further in view of Klabunde and further in view of Kirk-Othmer and further in view of Klabunde and further in view of Kirk-Othmer and further in view of Klabunde and further in view of Kirk-Othmer and further in view of Kirk-Othmer and further in view of Klabunde and further in view of Kirk-Othmer and further in view of Klabunde and further in view of Kirk-Othmer and further in view of Klabunde and further in view of Kirk-Othmer and further in view of Kirk-Ot

Othmer and further in view of Demaray (U.S. Patent No. 4,676,994) hereinafter "Demaray"; rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagaraj in view of Klabunde and further in view of Kirk-Othmer and further in view of Rigney et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,455,167) hereinafter "Rigney"; rejected claims 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagaraj in view of Klabunde and further in view of Kirk-Othmer and further in view of Demaray and Rigney; rejected claims 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagaraj in view of Klabunde and further in view of Kirk-Othmer and further in view of Tecle (U.S. Patent No. 5,922,403) hereinafter "Tecle"; rejected claims 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagaraj in view of Klabunde and further in view of Kirk-Othmer and further in view of Kirk-Othmer, Jenostable over Nagaraj in view of Klabunde and further in view of Kirk-Othmer, Rigney and Eppler.

Applicant incorporates by reference earlier responses to the above-referenced rejections, which rejections contained in the present Office Action being understood by Applicant to contain no additional grounds of rejection.

CONCLUSION

Applicant requests the entry of the present amendment and the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-2 and 6-26. Based on the clarifications contained in the supplemental Declaration under 37 C.F.R. §1.132 and amendments to the claims, Applicant further request allowance of claims 1-2 and 6-26, and issuance of the application as amended. A timely and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Attorney Docket No. 13DV-13673 (07783-0087) Serial No. 10/726.361

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees and credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-1059.

Respectfully submitted, McNEES, WALLACE & NURICK

By /K. Scott O'Brian/ K. Scott O'Brian Reg. No. 42,946 100 Pine Street, P.O. Box 1166 Harrisburg, PA 17108-1166 Tel: (217) 237,5402

Tel: (717) 237-5492 Fax: (717) 237-5300

Dated: April 24, 2007